

DEBATE ON QUESTION No. 999.**Issue of invitations to Khedda operations.**

* **Sri M. LINGANNA** (Nanjangud).—The question concerning the invitation issued by the State Government to several invitees was put by one of my Hon'ble friends, Sri H. K. Shivarudrappa, on 13th April 1954. He hails from Gundlupet constituency. Several of the supplementary answers furnished by the Government were not satisfactory and if I may be permitted to say so, are a little away from truth. And most of the members who rose subsequently to put supplementaries could not have the opportunity of putting supplementaries because your good self, Sir, was good enough to call the next question. I myself was not convinced with the answers given to supplementaries. To one of the questions put by the Hon'ble Member Sri H. K. Shivarudrappa, the answer given by the Minister concerned was almost evasive. To a particular question: 'What is the principle adopted by the State Government in the matter of issuing invitations to the persons on an occasion like that?', he answered that the place was limited and only the M.P.C.C. members and the members of the Executive of the State Legislature were invited.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—And also the representatives in the Opposition.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Yes, Sir. I accept that some of the Opposition have been invited and for that on behalf of the members who were invited I extend my heart-felt thanks to the Hon'ble Leader of the House. But that apart, the number of members that were invited on behalf of the M.P.C.C. is only about 16 or 17 in the given list wherein they have stated that 'these are people who have been invited'. But if I may say so, the total number of members of the Pradesh Congress Committee is only 72.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I may straightaway correct the mis-statement that is being made by my Hon'ble friend. There was no invitation to every member of the M.P.C.C. who

number about 100. We did not invite all the 100 people.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I invite the attention of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Members of the Executive Committee.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I am reading out the specific answer. 'Since the accommodation on the platform was limited the M.P.C.C. members and the State Legislature Executive Members were invited.' I was one of the members of the Congress Committee. And that apart, the total number of Provincial Congress Committee members is 92. If the answer was 'the Executive Committee members of the Mysore Congress Committee', then it would have been correct.

5 P.M.

But I am afraid that either the Minister in charge of the portfolio did not look into the correctness of the answer or the particular Secretary who had the privilege of placing this answer before the Minister was aware of the real

Mr. SPEAKER.—You need not go to Secretaries to Government, when the Ministers are here.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—So far as part (d) is concerned, I want a definite answer from the Minister. So far as the last question was concerned, he has replied that no action could be taken in this respect for want of time. Though in respect of supplementaries by Hon'ble Members, the Minister concerned was pleased to plead notice to furnish information as to the time when they received the telegram from the public and the date on which the Hon'ble Member Sri H. K. Shivarudrappa wrote the letter to the Minister concerned, I definitely understand that the said letter to the Minister concerned was written on 24th or 23rd and the telegram was sent by the public of Gundlupet on the 26th and the function took place on the 28th. And what is more, telegrams were sent not merely to the Secretaries, but also to the Minister concerned, and to the Chief Minister himself. What is the purpose with which these telegrams

(SRI M. LINGANNA.)

were sent, Sir? Here I may say that the telegrams were pre-paid telegrams. What is the intention with which these pre-paid telegrams were sent? It was with the object of getting a reply from the Minister concerned. If there was no accommodation, a reply to that effect could have been sent. What is the explanation that the Minister concerned is going to give? Is this the way in which the Minister should treat the representatives of the people? Is it the way a Responsible Ministry should treat responsible and respectable people of the State? These are days when we say that the sovereignty lies with the people and that people are the fountain-head of power and sovereignty. Is it in keeping with the dignity of the principle of democracy? However, Sir, I want a definite answer as to when the telegrams were received by the Minister concerned and when the letter was received.

In the list of invitations given to us, there is mention of Executive Engineer and some taluk officials having received invitation, whereas Members of the Legislature, Members who are the elected representatives of that taluk and who represent that constituency in the Assembly, were not extended the same invitation. I do not plead for myself or on behalf of anybody. There is a principle involved in this. In the case of a State function like Raja Sabha which is conducted by the State Government every year, every Member of this House is being invited. Khedda operation also is a State function and every Member of this House should be invited and is entitled to be invited. They may say that the seats were limited, but that seats were limited is no excuse for the State Government. I understand that nearly 1,500 persons were present on that occasion. If the space was limited, how could 1,500 persons witness the operations? What is the definite answer from the Minister concerned, so far as this particular aspect of the question is concerned? Am I to take it that only 150 persons were present on that occasion? How do the Government explain that only 150 persons were invited as against

74 or 75 applications? Why should they make this kind of invidious distinction? Is it not a Government function? As long as that function is a State Government function, all the Members have a right to be invited. I am afraid that the answers provided generally reveal their mind and so far as supplementaries put by Members of this House are concerned, I am sorry to say that they were treated in the most jocular way, and this leads me to doubt whether they have understood the very implication, the very intention of the question-hour and the effectiveness of the question-hour.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Is there a general discussion of the question?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is expected to make a short statement as per Rule 39, but he is making a very long speech.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Sir, I know personally Dr. R. Nagan Gowda is a man of truth. But he is not an exception to the general trend of the event. It is stated that we are living in an “age of useful lies”—I am quoting from a book which is supplied to us . . . and Dr. R. Nagan Gowda finds himself “trapped.”

So, Sir, in all humility I submit that the question should be more properly treated.

One more point I have forgotten to mention is with regard to invitations Government extended to the press representatives. I find from the list that the representatives of the ‘Times of India,’ the ‘Deccan Herald’ and the ‘Prajavani’ have not been invited. What is the policy of this Government in inviting certain representatives and not inviting certain others? Is this all that was taught to the party in power by the Father of the Nation? Has he not taught us that we must be generous towards even him who is most critical so far as our policies are concerned? I am concerned to see that principle for which we fought, the very principle on which the foundation of our freedom is laid is followed. I would not hesitate to invite my worst enemy if I am in power. Here, the policy that is pursued in regard to the invitations

extended to the Press and in regard to the responsibility of the Executive in answering the main questions or supplementaries is not one that deserves commendation. I want a definite answer to all these points raised during the discussion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ (ಪರಿಯಾಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬೆಡ್ಡಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚಾದ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಫಂಡ್ ಮೊಬಲಗಿಷ್ಟು?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You put all the questions.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಮಾರಿದರಿಂದ ಬಂದ ರಾಧವೇನು? ಅನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹರಾಜುಮುಖೇನ ಏಕೆಯಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಅಥವಾ ಕಿಮ್ಮತ್ತು ಮೇಲೆ ಏಕೆಯಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಅನೆಗಳ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾರು? ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲೇ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅನೆಗಳು ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ಕೊಡಗಿನಿಂದ ಅನೆಯನ್ನು ಖರೀದಿಗೆ ಕೊಂಡು ತರಲು ಕಾರಣವೇನು? ಅನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಿಕ್ಕಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಅನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಮಾರಲು ಪರ್ಮಿಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪೇಪರ್‌ನವರಿಗೂ ಇಳಿವಿಳಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟು 'ಡೆಕರ್ ಹೆರಾಲ್ಡ್' ಮತ್ತು 'ಪ್ರಜಾವಾಣಿ' ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡದಿರುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಫಂಡನ್ನು ಈ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇಳಿವಿಳಿಪಡಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸದಿರುವುದು ತಮ್ಮ ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲವೇ? ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಉತ್ತರದಂತೆ 136ನೆಯ ಸೀರಿಯಲ್ ನಂಬರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಅನಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರು, ಗುಂಡ್ಲುಪೇಟೆ—ಇವರಿಗೆ ಇಳಿವಿಳಿಪಡಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಗೌರವಯುತರಾದ ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇಳಿವಿಳಿಪಡಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸದೆ ಹೋದುದು ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತುಂಬ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಅದು ನಾಚಿಕೆಗೇಡಿನ ಕೆಲಸವಲ್ಲವೇ? ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರ ಪೈಕಿ "ಸತ್ಯ" ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಮೂರು ಇಳಿವಿಳಿಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು?

ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ, ಆ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ, ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೆ ಕಾರ್ಯದಂತೆ ಎಣಿಸಿ, invitation ಕಳುಹಿಸದಿದ್ದು ನಮಗೆ ತುಂಬ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೇನು ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ?

*Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, in connection with the recent kheddahs held in December 1953, invitations were issued to a select number of persons including distinguished visitors from outside the State. Since there was only very limited accommodation available on the platforms, invitations could not be sent to a larger number or to all those who had applied. It was

inevitable that the number of invitees had to be restricted and late and last minute applications had to be rejected.

The total number of seats available in the first platform was only 150 and it was therefore not possible to issue invitations to all Members of the Legislature since the distinguished visitors from Delhi, Ministers, Judges, Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Chairman and Deputy Chairman had also to be issued invitations within this number.

So far as Legislators or members of political parties were concerned, Government decided that M. P. C. C. Members and Legislature Executive Members and representatives of the Opposition Party should be invited. There is always a rush of applications on such occasions and Government only wish that the accommodation and other facilities were available on such a scale as to invite everyone who wished to attend the function.

The telegrams from certain residents of Gundlupet area were received in Bangalore very late on the night of Saturday, the 26th December 1953. As the next day happened to be a Sunday and as items of invitations had closed by then, there was no time to send a reply. Nevertheless, instructions had been issued to the Home Secretary who was in charge of the arrangements in Kakankote to issue invitations, should these persons contact him.

As could be easily realised, an event of this kind usually attracts hundreds of people and applications for passes or invitations naturally pour in. It is not easy to determine any universally acceptable method of disposing of such applications and much less of complying with all the applications received. I may assure the Hon'ble Members, however, that no discriminatory treatment has ever been contemplated.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for the day and meet tomorrow at 12 noon.

The House adjourned for the day at Fifteen Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Tuesday, the 20th April 1954.